

REMARKS

In response to the Examiner's comments about the Information Disclosure Statement, a completion of record is being filed with copies of the references the Examiner stated to be missing. An indication of the Examiner's consideration of the references is requested.

The Examiner has rejected all of the outstanding claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by JOHNSON. In view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks, applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent claims 1, 14, and 17 now define the designer tool kit modules (DTKs) as having different interactive voice response functionality. Independent claims 7, 16, and 20 now define the feature specific node types as having different interactive voice response functionality. The amendments are supported, *inter alia*, by page 12 of the specification. Exemplary interactive voice response functionalities include names directory functionality, automatic attendant functionality, zip code locator functionality, etc.

The Examiner relies upon JOHNSON's GUI to show the claimed DTKs. It is submitted, however, that a GUI does not provide interactive voice response functionality, as required by the amended claims. Moreover, the amended claims recite a plurality of DTKs. In contrast, JOHNSON has a single GUI. Moreover, the single GUI does not have different functionalities, much less different interactive voice response functionalities. Rather it has a single functionality: interfacing with a user. Thus, for at least these reasons, it is requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of independent claims 1, 14, and 17 and provide an indication of their allowability.

The Examiner relies upon the GUI "following actions" to show the claimed feature specific node types. JOHNSON's following actions is patentably distinguishable from the claimed multiple interactive voice response functionalities. JOHNSON's actions are described as adding, deleting, and changing a node, and maintaining a profile. Such actions are not interactive voice response functionalities, but are more generic configuration actions.

In addition, the relied upon portion of JOHNSON does not show anything “feature specific.” In fact, it is unclear how “following actions” relates to a “feature specific node type.” Further explanation is respectfully requested if the Examiner maintains his position. Thus, for at least these reasons, it is requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of independent claims 7, 16, and 20 and provide an indication of their allowability.

New claims 21 - 26 do not add any prohibited new matter. For example, the claims are supported by the description of exemplary DTKs on pages 16 - 20. Each DTK/feature specific node is described as having tools for the caller and tools for the customer administrator (i.e., different audiences). Moreover, claims 21 - 26 are believed to be allowable over the applied prior art.

Dependent claims 2 - 6, 8 - 13, 15, 18, and 19 are also believed to recite further patentable subject matter of the invention and therefore are also believed allowable over the prior art. As such, allowance of the dependent claims is deemed proper for at least the same reasons noted for the independent claims, in addition to reasons related to their own recitations. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and an indication of the allowability of all of the claims in the present application.

The above amendments have been presented merely for the purpose of clarification, and not to overcome the applied prior art. Accordingly, no estoppel is deemed to result from any of the present amendments.

P21784.A03

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
M. PLAN

Will. Z. Lydd Reg. No.
Bruce H. Bernstein 41,568
Reg. No. 29,027

October 1, 2003
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191